



APPEAL PANEL DECISION FORM

I. CLAIMANT AND CLAIM INFORMATION

Claimant Name	Last/Name of Business [REDACTED]	First	Middle
Claimant ID	[REDACTED]	Claim ID	[REDACTED]
Claim Type	Business Economic Loss		
Law Firm	[REDACTED]		

II. DECISION

Select the Compensation Amount set forth in either BP's Final Proposal or the Claimant's Final Proposal as the final outcome on the claim and check the appropriate box to signify your decision.

<input type="checkbox"/> BP's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$0
	Risk Transfer Premium	1.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Claimant's Final Proposal	Compensation Amount	\$ [REDACTED]
	Risk Transfer Premium	1.25
	Prior Payment Offset	\$0

III. PRIMARY BASIS FOR PANELIST DECISION

Please select the primary basis for your decision. You may also write a comment describing the basis for your decision.

- Error in documentation review.**
- Error in calculation.**
- Error in RTP multiplier.**
- Error in Prior Spill-Related Payment Amount.**
- No error.**

Comment (optional):

BP appeals the BEL award to claimant, a [REDACTED] church located in [REDACTED]. BP presents three issues for review: claimant failed to submit federal tax returns in support of its claim as required by Exhibit 4A of the Settlement Agreement; the Claims Administrator improperly included royalty income from oil and gas leases of church property which inflated claimant's award by [REDACTED] pre-RTP ; and the Claims Administrator incorrectly attributed 2008 royalty payments to the month received rather than to the months they were earned. The



DEEPWATER HORIZON
CLAIMS CENTER
ECONOMIC & PROPERTY DAMAGE CLAIMS

eligibility notice issued acknowledged the claim was sufficiently matched and used the general BEL methodology to calculate the award under policy 495. Claimant is a non-profit entity and is not required by law to file a federal tax return. For this claim claimant submitted a Verification of Non-filing from the IRS along with other supporting financial documents. These submissions are allowable and sufficient under policy 307v.2. Next a review of the record also confirms the Claims Administrator properly applied the provisions of the Settlement Agreement and policy 373 v.2 to include royalty income received from oil and gas leases of church property as part of claimant's general revenue for award calculation purposes. At least two other panel decisions support this conclusion as recognized by the panel decision rendered on May 14,2015, in claim number [REDACTED]. Finally, a review of the record reveals the program accountants determined royalty payments were received on an intermittent basis and the one in issue was received in June 2008, a part of claimant's benchmark period. It was not an abuse of professional discretion to attribute this payment to the month when it was received under policy 495 similar to the treatment of real estate commissions approved by prior panel decisions. The claim was sufficiently matched. There is no error. Remand is not warranted. The award is affirmed and the appeal of BP is denied.